

- More*
- Q. As I understand, Mr. TOGO, that final note which was sent on December 7, 1941 (Tokyo time) to NOMURA in Washington was not a declaration of war but a final note breaking off negotiations.
- A. As I said before, the final notification of the Japanese government was to be delivered by the Ambassadors in Washington at the instructions of the Japanese government at 3 AM, December 8, Tokyo time. That notification did not contain the words, "declaration of war," but did state the cessation of negotiations and the severance of diplomatic relations, which in the light of the situation prevailing at that time was considered tantamount to a declaration of war.
- Q. Who would be considered responsible, who would you consider responsible for the composition of that note.
- A. That notification, as I have previously explained, was a summation of the results of the studies and discussions which took place at the liaison conferences regarding negotiations with the United States. The note itself was written by the Foreign Office, but the responsibility for the composition rests with the participating members of the liaison conferences. The responsibility for the contents of the notification rests with the members of the liaison conferences. Furthermore, the matter was also reported to the Cabinet and passed the Cabinet without objection.
- Q. Could you give me the names of the individuals at the liaison conferences and the Cabinet members who would be considered responsible for the contents of the note.
- A. As I have said at a previous meeting, members of a liaison conference who were responsible for the study and discussions on the matter were TOJO, SHIMADA, SUGIYAMA, NAGANO, TSUKADA, ITO, KAYA, SUZUKI, and the three secretaries, HOSHINO, NUTO and OKA. As to the members of the Cabinet, under the constitution they are responsible for decisions of the Cabinet, even on matters outside of the competence of their respective offices.

\* \* \*

Page 3

- Q. I understood from you that the note was composed by the Foreign Office after the contents of what the note should contain had been decided upon at the liaison conference. I

also understand that after the note was composed by the Foreign Office it was presented for approval to the Cabinet on December 1, 1941, at which time the Cabinet approved it. Is my understanding correct.

- A. The First part of your understanding is correct, that is, that the writing of the note took place in accordance with the decision of the Liaison conference as to its contents. However, I should like to make some correction as to the date. December 1 was the date of the Imperial Conference, at which the decision for war was made. However, previous to the Imperial Conference the main points of the note to be sent were reported to the Cabinet; but as to the drafting of the note, that came afterwards, and at a later Cabinet meeting the main points were further explained and the continuation of the explanation that was made at the former Cabinet meeting. I cannot recall definitely, but it seems to be around November 30, but I could have the date more definitely confirmed later.

\* \* \*

Page 4

- Q. Do you not think that the time in preparing the note after the details of what it should contain were decided on November 30 was too long.
- A. As you say, it seems that considerable time was consumed, but before the final draft was approved the note went through a series of many revisions. The two secretaries of the Liaison conference, the Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau, MUTO, and the Chief of the Navy Affairs Bureau, CKA, were in frequent contact with the Foreign Office in connection with the drafting of the note. They represented the driving force of the time, that is, the Army War Office and the Army General Staff and the Navy Office and the Navy General Staff, and on practical matters these two men represented these two fighting services in making frequent contacts with the Foreign Office in the making of the draft. As a consequence, many revisions were gone through. Being personally interested in the process and course of the revision that was gone through, I wanted to have some concrete materials on the subject, that is, the copies of the many revisions that were made at the time. But I found out that these materials, too, had been destroyed in the air raid; and, therefore, I am not able to offer substantial materials to explain my point. Had I had such materials, I could more clearly explain some of the reasons for the delay that was taken in completing the draft of the note.

\* \* \*

Page 4

- Q. From what you have stated would you consider that the members of the Cabinet and members of the liaison conference, whose names you have mentioned, are equally responsible with you as regards to the contents of the note and its delivery.

Page 5

- A. As to the contents of the note, I think it is but natural that all the members of the liaison conference are responsible. As to the cabinet, they would have at least a final responsibility in that they expressed no objection, that is, from the legal point of view. Of course, it all depends whether you view the matter superficially or formally, or whether you would like to view it more profoundly. But, practically speaking, in the light of actualities it might be said that there is a difference in the degree of responsibility by the liaison conference and the Cabinet because not all the Cabinet members attended the liaison conference, but the situation was such that whatever was approved by the liaison conference was approved by the Cabinet. Although there may be a difference in degree of responsibility, the Cabinet might have at least a nominal responsibility.

\* \* \*

Doc 2892

一九四三年三月十一日 中華民國三十二年三月十一日

[illegible]

同、ソノ貴佐者ハ自ラ考ヘタリヨイデセウ、貴方  
ハ健康作爲ノ貴佐ハ誰ニアルト思ヒマスカ。

答、ソノ通告ハ、前ニ就任シタ廻リ、合衆國トノ  
交渉ニ係リテノ通船管理デ付ハレタ研究ト關  
係ノ綜合結果デマツタノデス。ソノ通告其ノ  
モノハ外國船隻ノ手ヲ引カレマシタガ、ソノ結  
果ニ就スル状況ニ通船管理ニ参加シタ委員ニ  
イリマス。ソノ通告ノ内容ニ就スル責任ハ通

Doc 2892

総書記ノ官職員ニイリマス。ナボソノ上、云  
件ハ内閣ニ報告サレ、臨時一致テ同意ヲ得  
通シタデス。

問、ソノ通牒内容ニ責任アルト思ヘレル通牒書記  
員ト内閣々係ノ名目ヲイデラレマスカ。

答、同ノ通牒ノ時書ツタヤリニ、本件、近頃、陸  
軍ニ責任ノアル通牒書記員ハ東條、嶋田、杉  
山、永田、塚田、宮東ノ書翰ノ責任、鈴木及  
ビ星野、武部、内ノ三氏記書デス。内閣々係  
トシテハ、憲法上、各省ノ責任外ノコトニツ  
イテモ、内閣ノ決断ニ就シテハ責任ガイリマ  
ス。

× × ×

第三頁

問、貴方ニ伺フコトコロカラ、ソノ通牒ハ通牒書  
記テソノ内容ガ決定サレタカラ、外務省ニヨ  
ツテ製作サレタコトガワカリマシタ。  
ソシテ又通牒ガ外務省ニヨツテ製作サレタ後、  
一九四一年十二月一日ニ、承認ヲ得ルタメニ  
内閣ニ提出サレ、内閣ハ通牒又ラ可決シタコ  
トガワカリマシタ。コレニ同意ヒイリマセン  
カ。

答、最初ノ部分ハ正シイ、即チ通告ノ作成ハ、ソ

2.

Doc 2892

ノ内容ニ關シテハ逓給會館ノ決議ニ從ツテ行  
ハレタノデス。シカシソノ日附ニ就テ、訂正  
シタイト思ヒマス。十二月一日ハ御面會館ノ  
出デアリ、其ノ會議ヲ戔學ヲスルトイフコト  
ニ決議サレタノデス。然シ、御面會館ノ面ニ、  
逓給スベキ通牒ノ三要素ハ内ニニ報告サレテ  
ナマシタ。但通牒通章ハ後ニ行ハレ、後ノ開  
議テ更ニ三要素ノ説明ガアリ、面會館ニ於ケ  
ル既にノ議ガ行ハレタ、ハツキリ思ヒ出セマ  
センガ、十一月三十日ハ、ヨウニ思ハレマス  
ガ、日附ハ後テモツト適當ニシ得ルト思ヒマ  
ス。

× × ×

第四頁

同、十一月三十日ニソノ評シイ内容ガ決定サレタ  
カラ通牒ノ準備期間ガ長スギルト思ヒマセン  
カ。

答、オツシギル通り、相當ナ時間ガ要サレマシ  
タ。シカシは後ノ原案ガ可決サレル面ニ、通  
牒ハ何長ニ何長ヲ訂正サレマシタ。逓給會議  
ノ二人ノ書記官、算學局長武田及ヒ淺草算學  
局長同ハ、外務省トコノ原稿ノ起草ニツイテ、  
要々説明シマシタ。彼等ハソノ當時ノ推進方

Dec 28 1922

ヲ代表シテキタ、即チ連軍信、参謀總長、海軍省、軍令部長デシタ。ソシテ實際問題ニ於テハ、コノ二人ハ原案製作ニツイテ外務省ト云々連絡ヲトリニツノ草部ヲ代表シテキマシタ。ソノ結果、幾多ノ修正ガナサレマシタ。ソノ手原ト修正ニ個人的ニ興味ヲモツテキタノデ、私ハ何カソノ問題ノ具體的ナ資料ヲ得タイト思ヒマシタ。即チソノ時ニナサレタ幾クノ修正ノ稿シ等。シカシソレヲモ整理ニヨツテ漏失シテシマツタコトガワカリマシタ、デスカラ、私ハ私ノ云ヒタイ長點ヲ説明スルヤウナ費費ノアル資料提供ガ出来マセン。モシ新カル資料ガアレバ、ソノ原案完成ニ要シタ延延理由ノ内モツトハツキリ、説明出来ルモノモアツタラウト思ヒマス。

× × ×

因、アナタノ原案ナサツタコトカラ、通告ノ内容トソノ付起ニ關シテ、アナタガ名ヲイゲタ關係ト連絡會議員進ハアアタト同様責任ガアルト思ヒマス。

第五頁。

答、通告ノ内容ニ關シテハ、連絡會議員全員ガ責任アリトスルノハ自然ノコトダト思ヒマス。

Doc 2892

内閣ニ照シテハ、彼等ハ反戦、ツマリ法的ニ  
反戦ヲシナカツタトイフ點ニ於テ少クトモ責  
任ノ責任ヲ有スルモノト思ヒマス。勿論ソレ  
ハ、アア々ガコノ間違ヲ表す内閣又ハ形式的ニ  
考ヘルカ、又ハモット深く考ヘタイト思フカ  
ニヨツテ異リマス。シカシ實際ノトコロ、現  
實ノ問題ニ照シテ、連絡會議ト内閣ノ責任ノ  
進展ハ異ルトイヘルカモ知レヌ、何故ナラバ  
スベテノ關係ガ連絡會議ニ出席シタノデナク、  
連絡會議ニヨツテ可決サレタモノハ何デモ内  
閣デ可決サレルコトニナツテキタヤワナ状態  
デシムカラデス。ソノ責任進展ニハ差ガアル  
カモ知レマセンガ内閣ハ少クトモ名義上ノ責  
任ガアリマス。

× × ×